

## **February 6, 2003 WG4 Telecon**

### ***Participants:***

Jonathan Hammer (MITRE CAASD)  
Steve Koczo (Rockwell Collins)  
Joel Wichgers (Rockwell Collins)  
Dara Gibson (FAA)  
Sheila Mariano and Paul Lipsky (FAA, Seattle)  
Chuck Manberg for Greg Stayton (ACSS)  
Gene Wong (FAA)  
Randy Bone (MITRE CAASD)  
Stuart Searight (FAA)  
Tom Foster (TRIOS)  
Bob Grappel (MIT LL)  
Robert Duffer (FAA)  
Jim Maynard (UPS-AT)  
Michael Petri (FAA)  
Bob Manning (DoD)  
Ann Drumm (MIT LL)  
Bob Hilb (UPS)  
Bob Passman (FAA)  
Lee Etnyre (UPS-AT)

### **Agenda:**

- 1) Review of WG1 inputs to Chapter 3 for the CDTI subsystem
- 2) Schedule discussion

### ***Review of WG1 inputs to Chapter 3 for the CDTI subsystem – Randy Bone***

Randy provided an overview. He referred us to the table in the back of the document that listed features versus applications (required, desirable, etc).

Question on whether there is an EVAcq and EVApp alert or if this is actually the CD alert.

Referring to the text:

‘when available’, what does this mean; isn’t this ‘required’ information. This should be interpreted to under what conditions the information be displayed. Need to know what resolution is required on the data from ASSAP.

We want to organize this information by “application categories”.

Jonathan wants to integrate this section in the interface section.

Stu – caution that we don’t write the MOPS in the MASPS.

Tom - 3.2.5.3 seems out of place.

### **Reviewing Section 3.2.6 Display Features:**

Joel Wichgers commented on features that must be displayed “continuously”. This may not allow “panning”, where ownship is not shown; also some concern about excessive clutter for aircraft on the ground and the need for altitude indication.

Need reference to “traffic display criteria” (relates to altitude filter).

“Field of regard”, etc., we need to establish the criteria for what should be displayed “continuously”.

Tom – could have “basic” criteria and “unique / application specific” criteria.

Comment on “common” range reference for shared displays for item 6 in 3.2.6.1.1.

Something needs to be said about “North-up” display – add a note.

Randy asked if the reference to Aerodrome Surface Maps is sufficient for this document or is more detail required? (are the references to DO-272 {which list all/many possible features} and to DO-257A {which identifies what features should be displayed} adequate).

Aerodrome runways – Sheila noted that not all runways are included in some of the databases (e.g., some runways below 3500 ft may not be included). Add the notes referring to DO-272 and DO-257A in 3.2.6.1.5 also for this section.

Add a note to the effect that ‘graphical depiction of available runways from adequate databases’ shall be displayed.

Randy needed to leave. Bob Hilb covered the rest of the CDTI discussion / presentation.

Bob Grappel commented on the directionality requirement in section 3.2.6.2.2. He noted that the requirement to be within 5 degrees or better to show directionality seems extreme. He would like to see this reduced substantially. Bob H. noted what was intended here was “specific” directionality versus “general” directionality – the distinction needs to be clarified. Tom indicated that we need to be consistent with the ADS-B MASPS which states 6 degrees.

On 3.2.6.1.7, the reference to 14.2 nm is too specific and does not apply for all final approach courses. Bob will change it to ‘tbd’ but will reference the 14.2 nm number to the 747 document; also will change the words to ‘extended runway centerline depiction’.

Concerning the requirement to display ANSD (section 3.2.6.1.8), Jim M. noted that this requirement is not clear. Bob noted that if a “Desired” option is selected for implementation, then the display of ANSD becomes a requirement.

Also as new applications are developed that require new CDTI capabilities, these should be captured / added into the Table that summarizes 'required' and 'desired' features.

The group got into an extended discussion on how new applications requirements would be addressed in standards documents, i.e., MASPS and MOPS, and whether or not new application requirements should be captured in ASA MASPS appendices or in the body of the document. It was stated that WG4 is proceeding on capturing the requirements in the body of the documents directly, and application appendices provide background material and supporting information on how requirements were derived. Bob H. noted concern that any new applications will require revisions to a large number of MASPS and MOPS, which is undesirable. After some discussion, Bob H. indicated that he understood WG4's approach, and that the approach used in the current CDTI write-up that is being reviewed may not be at the appropriate level of detail for the MASPS. Bob H. and WG1 took the action to regroup and revisit how the CDTI material should best be represented at the MASPS level.

### ***Schedule discussion***

Jonathan reviewed the schedule table on completing the applications.

**EV Acq** – Ann Drumm noted that the schedule can be met. With regard to the potential restructuring of the fault trees to be in line with the CD fault tree offered previously by Jonathan, Jonathan will coordinate with Ann Drumm to get together early next week to discuss the restructuring of the fault tree (Lee will also participate). Buddy review date is okay with Jonathan and Lee.

**EV App** – Ann indicated this schedule is OK. Buddy review date is okay with Jonathan and Lee.

**ASSA** - Schedule is OK to Joel, Sheila, and Tom.

**FAROA** – New dates, 3/31, 4/18, 5/5, 5/8, respectively for each of the columns.

**CD** – Draft ready by 2/20 is okay for Ganghuai; Lee will complete VFR case by that date, but will need until 3/5 to complete the IFR safety analysis. Michael can complete review by 3/21.

**ACM** - Schedule OK by all, Tim to coordinate any late changes with Michael and Stu.

**ASIA** – Schedule OK.

**CSPA** – Schedule OK.